

THE CLASSICAL WEEKLY

Entered as second-class matter November 18, 1907, at the Post Office, New York, N. Y., under the Act of Congress of March 1, 1879

VOL. VIII

NEW YORK, OCTOBER 24, 1914

No. 4

A PROPOSED INTERNATIONAL CLASSICAL ALLIANCE

The following is the outline of a letter which I am sending (in French, English, and Italian) to a comparatively large number of men, in Germany and other countries, who, as I happen to know, are kindly disposed to instruction in the classical languages¹. I most respectfully ask those who receive the letter to express to me their personal opinion in the matter as soon as convenient, and eventually to make any suggestions that may occur to them.

HEIDELBERG.

G. UHLIG.

The opposition to classical instruction, the ultimate purpose of which is the complete elimination of humanistic training for the youth of today, is confined not simply to one or two countries, but is raging in almost all civilized lands. This opposition has been carried on with especial vigor during the last decades in Germany and Austria. It is therefore wholly reasonable that a petition be sent out from these two countries to all friends of humanistic training, of any nationality whatsoever, asking them to form an alliance for the protection and furthering of instruction in classical subjects.

The Deutscher Gymnasialverein, established in 1890, now has about 3300 members, among whom there are men from all the higher professional classes, including many Austrians. The present Chairman of the Verein hereby takes the liberty of submitting to all interested a plan by which the desired alliance could be most effectively and expeditiously brought about.

In his opinion, we should have a polylingual international correspondence, in which annual reports of only a few pages could be made concerning the status of the cause for which we are fighting in the various countries. One of the three leading languages, French, English or German, could be used in making these reports; Latin and Italian might also be included.

¹For a copy of the very interesting communication herewith presented we are indebted to President Butler, of Columbia University, who sent it to me early in the summer with the suggestion that a translation of the letter be prepared for THE CLASSICAL WEEKLY. Dr. Butler's high opinion of the value of classical studies was printed in 7.65. The translation was prepared by Dr. Allan W. Porterfield, of the Department of Germanic Languages at Barnard College.

From the reference to a coming address of Professor Shorey in May last it is clear that the letter was issued in the first third of the present year. The current situation in Europe makes the letter even more interesting than it was when written and circulated; the action proposed has become even more necessary. All lovers of the Classics may be one in the hope that the present conditions, so unfavorable both to Bildung and to Kultur, may soon terminate, and that that Dr. Uhlig's suggestions may then bear fruit.

C. K.

We hope, however, to receive expressions of opinion not simply from Austria, Germany, France, and England, but also from Spain, Portugal, Italy, Switzerland, Greece, Rumania, Russia, Sweden, Norway, Denmark, Holland, Belgium, and North America.

For we know full well, from newspapers, letters, and personal interviews, that instruction in the Classics is meeting with great opposition in those countries as well as in Germany and Austria, France and England. The reports sent to us in this way would not only satisfy our legitimate curiosity; they could also be of great practical value owing to the large amount of good advice that our colleagues would find in them. If they could be made as brief as has been above indicated, and if only a few hundred subscribers could be secured, the little annual could be furnished for less than a mark. Carl Winter's Universitätsbuchhandlung in Heidelberg, which already publishes Das Humanistische Gymnasium, the official organ of the Deutscher Gymnasialverein, will soon be in a position to assume the responsibility of bringing out the paper we have in mind.

Every now and then someone says that humanistic studies are in a condition of irresistible retrogression leading on to complete disappearance from the curricula. The individual who makes this remark does not know, or has forgotten, the history of higher instruction, and the peculiar energy that attaches to the study of antiquity and forms an integral part of it. This life-giving force has manifested itself in an especially creditable way in those particular places where study of the Classics seemed to be destined to an eventual overthrow. Ernst Curtius once made the following apposite comparison between classical instruction and the Christian religion:

Both have this in common, that they occasionally seem to lose their hold on the popular mind and are looked upon as done for and obsolete. They are like the rivers of Greece, which, coming down from the mountain-sides, lose themselves for a while in the recesses of the earth and flow along hidden under the hard, sterile surface, only to break forth at another point and give rise to a luxurious vegetation.

Just so are we, in the midst of all this antihumanistic agitation in Germany, witnessing a mighty revival of interest in the literature and the culture of ancient Greece and Rome. The fact that in those old Hellenic cities, and on the Tiber, ideas were once expressed and

theories formulated that give eternal value to the intellectual life of mankind, and which cannot be reckoned among the things that time begets and time destroys—this fact is just now being realized in ever widening circles. If we turn our attention to other countries we see two tendencies that most heartily support our conviction. That powerful land beyond the sea, whose relation to antiquity is not nearly so intimate as is the case with the majority of European countries, and whose citizens no one can accuse of blindly adopting the traditions of the years that are gone—that country shows an ever increasing appreciation of the value of humanistic training. In Europe, however, where some people have imagined that Greek and Latin should be completely eliminated from our Schools, and that we should thereby constitute the vanguard of culture and progress, we see what has happened: the unsuccessful experiment has resulted in a grievous disappointment to the progressives, who struck out on the wrong road, and whose fatal march is now being accompanied by the command for a return to the original course.

But these facts which seem to controvert any temporary pessimism should not lead Humanists into believing that all is well, and that they can from now on sit with folded hands and let the future take care of itself. Culture needs at all times that invaluable element, that otherwise unobtainable basis, which comes from intimate acquaintance with, and real appreciation of, classical languages and literatures as taught by those who know. If this classical element is at any time or in any country eliminated, or even retarded, civilization receives in consequence a shock which all scholars and trainers of scholars should try to prevent.

One of the means of preventing this retardation of culture would be the banding together of Humanists in various countries. A step in this direction has already been taken by the Union of the Friends of the Humanistic Gymnasium in Vienna. On May 22, 1912, the Union was addressed by the distinguished mathematician and physicist, Henri Poincaré, who, unfortunately, was called away two months later from his life so full of work and so abounding in good results. M. Poincaré spoke on Humanism and the Natural Sciences. In most illuminating fashion he gave expression to his conviction that the study of ancient languages and literatures—aside from its disciplinary value—is full of possibilities of increasing one's linguistic efficiency and giving one a hold on the ideal things of life that is otherwise difficult to obtain. On February 22, 1913, the distinguished Roman archaeologist, Giacomo Boni, addressed the Union on the excavations on the Palatine in the preceding year. For the coming session in May, Paul Shorey of Chicago, the American Exchange Professor now in Berlin, has promised an address on National Culture and Classical Training. These are, to a certain degree, the first steps toward the founding of an international alliance such as we have in mind. Let us take the other steps!

If we succeed in our undertaking, this year or next, an additional point will have been gained: we live in an era of strong antagonism between the leading nations of the world—an antagonism which seems to threaten the very peace of the world. In such times it is exceedingly important that the cultured classes of all nations unite in all common causes that are good, exchange their opinions, come to an agreement on points of interest, and thereby strengthen the bonds of the mutual friendship that ought to exist. And it seems to us that an alliance among all who are kindly disposed to humanistic training in our institutions of learning would be an important step in this direction; it would bring us closer and closer to that international understanding and appreciation for which all cultured men long and toward which all cultured men strive.

THE MODERN PSYCHOLOGY AND FORMAL DISCIPLINE

In a book recently published in Boston, a prominent clergyman remarks that we have to thank agnosticism for having killed off dogmatism, and then, without redipping his pen, he finds reason to blame agnosticism for having given birth to a new form of dogmatism, no less virulent and unreasonable than the old, but hostile to religion, putting religious beliefs to scientific tests which, if applied to the ordinary activities of life, could result only in the paralysis of most efforts for social and individual improvement. With a competent estimate of the use and limitations of scientific methods of arriving at the truth, the learned divine foresees and predicts a marked revival of religious interest and activities with a practical creed purified of the crudities and incongruities that formerly brought religion into discredit.

What agnosticism did for dogmatism, the modern psychology has done for the formal discipline of the old type, which regarded the mind as a sort of mental muscle to be developed by sustaining heavy weights and hardships, its activities resulting in stored-up energy known as general power, which at the will of the happy possessor could be utilized for turning out a sermon in time of peace or a strategem in time of war. It is this type of formal discipline to which Professor Schmidt savagely alludes in his article in *THE CLASSICAL WEEKLY* 7.162-163, when he says:

If the main purpose in teaching Latin is to be formal mental discipline, if its educational value is to be measured according as it is distasteful and strains the mind to overcome meaningless difficulties, the traditional method unquestionably serves the purpose very well. But if the purpose of teaching Latin is to have the pupil learn the language, the present search for a new method is the best evidence that the old does not accomplish this.

Less than fifteen years ago there was begun at Columbia University a series of experiments or tests consisting of efforts to select words containing certain letters, to estimate the area of geometrical figures with

a view to ascertaining how far the proficiency acquired in such simple specialties might be made to show improvement in mental functions of a similar character. The result of these experiments as carried on in New York and in other institutions devoted to psychological research went to prove that the effects of improvement in any single mental function upon improvement in other functions had been grossly exaggerated. Most teachers of the disciplinary subjects will recall with painful clearness the dismay with which they came to recognize the force of this truth. Upon the more openminded and progressive teachers of Latin, these conclusions, so pitilessly branded upon modern educational thought, have often been stunning and paralyzing, leaving them to limp their way through their professional life and to regard their work as mere potboiling drudgery unproductive of social efficiency.

For some years now we have not dared to speak of general mental power and have ventured to mention formal discipline only to kindred spirits and then in a scarcely audible whisper. In stating the aims of Latin teaching, our New York City syllabus altogether omits what was for so many years looked upon as the principal purpose of the study of the Classics—formal mental discipline. As, in religious thought, agnosticism in destroying dogmatism gave birth to a new dogmatism and to a host of petty cults intended to replace Christianity, so, in educational thought, has the modern psychology in smiting the crudities of pedagogical theory given great impetus to the content side of education and to what is known as the 'bread and butter aim'. In Latin teaching, the new order of things has found expression in a greatly awakened interest in what is known as the Direct Method—this so-called 'new method' which bears a striking resemblance to the short lived and fantastic schemes of that eighteenth century charlatan, Basedow, as described in Quick's Educational Reformers.

While inclined to adopt an attitude of 'watchful waiting' as to whether the modern apostles of the methods of Basedow and Comenius are likely to turn out a better quality of Latinity than we are now doing by what they call the 'old humdrum method', fair-minded teachers will frankly admit that, if the purpose of Latin teaching is to have the pupil learn the language, we have no reason to point with pride to the results of our efforts. We should like to be allowed to believe that our teaching has been of some benefit to the many who studied Latin but a short time—even one or two years—rather than a complete loss to all except the small percentage of college graduates who can honestly claim to know Latin. After all our efforts of the past twenty-five years to enrich our teaching of the Classics by the introduction of copious material drawn from history and antiquities, from contrasts of ancient and modern life, social, individual and political, it is certainly most uncomfortable to find ourselves herded with those medieval monks who, in their aim to discipline the soul, taught their pupils to eat the worms

with the core while throwing away the fruit, to be told that our efforts of the past years have been useless to the world because Dr. Rouse and his American imitators were born a half century too late.

Such a thesis is too monstrously preposterous to be accepted. One must be able to believe that there is no God in his Heaven and all's wrong with the world to hold that through sheer perversity educators have for more than a century been working along lines leading nowhere and utterly wasting the time of a great majority of their pupils.

When one comes to investigate the attitude of the most advanced thinkers in educational theory to-day, he is likely to arrive at the conclusion that, in altogether abandoning the aim of formal mental discipline in our Latin teaching, we are like the aristocrats of the White Terror under Louis XVIII, 'plus royalistes que le roi', that modern psychology has not eliminated from its terminology the words formal discipline, though employing them with a connotation very different from that of twenty-five years ago.

To begin with Professor Thorndike, whose work in experimental psychology has provided with much ammunition the foes of the Classics, the following quotations from *Education*, published in 1912, would seem to show that the difference between him and those who believe in disciplinary education are quantitative rather than qualitative:

As an aim, mental discipline is best used to mean the increase of a person's *general* powers to respond well in thought and action and feeling. It is thus contrasted with particular knowledge, particular powers, etc. . . Other things being equal, the former will obviously be better worth aiming at than the latter (pp. 42-43).

It <the doctrine of mental discipline> is a doctrine of expediency, declaring, for example, that to improve the general ability to be accurate in all thinking by so little as one tenth of one per cent. would be better than to improve the ability to add integers alone by a hundred per cent. This is of course true (44).

In general, the improvement of any one of the abilities which are recognized as desirable helps any other. There are certain elements—such as neglecting the impulse to idle and to heed sensory distractions, expecting to work with a will, desiring to find a wise method, not being worried or overexcited, and the like—which may play a part in making a man's responses to almost any situation more effective (113).

In summing up the matter Professor Thorndike confirms what we have already noted as to qualitative rather than the quantitative differences between the modern psychologist and the older school of educational thinkers, by reaching the following conclusion:

It is agreed that a gain in one ability improves others only in so far as it is proved to do so—that the question of the disciplinary value of any training is a question of fact to be measured, not an article of educational faith to be assumed.

Professor Thorndike can hardly expect us to suspend the processes of education pending the results of such investigations or in the meantime to abandon the

doctrine under examination. As in other activities of life, so in education we have been, are and probably always shall be forced to rely largely on faith—a faith ever prepared to modify its tenets in accordance with the truths of science as they may be worked out by investigators.

Professor Bagley, the author of *The Educative Process*, is no friend of the Classics, which he regards as a sort of rudimentary educational organ. However, this educational thinker finds that formal discipline is productive of generalized ideals of work, rather than generalized habits or general powers, and that such ideals are of very great significance in the educative process. He finds that

students who come into his classes in psychology after completing thorough courses in mathematics do far better work than those who have not had this training. . . . Something has been carried over from one study to the other. It is certainly not the *habit* of study, nor are the points that mathematics and psychology have in common sufficient to account for this difference. (*The Educative Process* 211).

His experience in this regard is that of many teachers of the exact sciences, who testify to the superior work in their classes of pupils who have previously had a thorough training in the Classics.

Professor Bagley thus sums up his chapter on formal discipline:

The doctrine of formal discipline assumed that the mastery of a certain subject gave one increased power to master other subjects. It is clear that there is a certain amount of truth in this statement, provided that we understand very clearly that this increased power must always take the form of an ideal that will function as judgment and not of an unconscious predisposition that will function as habit (216).

In declaring the development of ideals to be the chief work of education, the author of *The Educative Process* boldly says:

Indeed, it is not too much to say that, if one must choose between the two, the doctrine of formal discipline, with all its fallacies, would be a far safer risk than the doctrine of exclusively intrinsic values. The mere subject matter of knowledge might be likened to the letter that killeth; the ideal, to the spirit that maketh alive.

In 1910 appeared *Habit-Formation and the Science of Teaching*, than which no pedagogical work of modern times has attracted wider or more deserved attention. Though, as stated by its author, Dr. Rowe, this book had its origin in an investigation, made several years ago, of the formulative value of Latin and Greek, its application to the specific problems of the High School are so meager as to give rise to the hope that now, since the author, as principal of Wadleigh High School, is no longer engrossed with the problems of elementary instruction, he will supplement this valuable work with one dealing specifically with Secondary School teaching. While leaving one with the impression that the author owes the world another book, for

breadth of view over the entire field of pedagogical controversy and for an essentially practical solution of the problems raised by modern psychology, Dr. Rowe's work has no peer. While holding no brief for the Classics, this work will repay a teacher of Latin and Greek for its careful perusal by greatly assisting him to formulate, for his own comfort at least, a rational defense of the faith that abides in him as to the social efficiency of what he is doing, notwithstanding the din of clamorous and hostile criticism.

Dr. Rowe finds "in organization of experience the essential of progress", in "organization of experience the excuse for the existence of the teacher".

Modern pedagogy has shown a tendency to follow false gods and has sought the more elusive general notion or the more definite practical skill, but nowhere has there been more than the faintest glimmer of recognition that the teacher's aim is always the organization of the child's experience, whether that experience is made up largely of sense impressions, of thought elaborations, or of muscular movements. By no verbal juggling can this organizing tendency be escaped. It has developed the general notion itself; habituation is a phase of it; custom, fashion, system, classification have all resulted from it (8).

Finding, as he does, in organization and habituation "the excuse for the existence of the teacher", the author is naturally drawn into the controversy regarding formal discipline. While attempting no defense of the 'old discredited notion of formal discipline', he finds evidences that one habit may affect another and so result in something like general habits in three ways. First, there may be common elements, as for example the serviceability of clear and accurate expression of thought in many activities of life as well as in the classroom. Secondly, "the method of procedure in the special habit may evidently be applicable to a much larger field", as in the extensive and varied uses of card catalogues. Thirdly, "mental attitudes or ideals tend by chance variation and by suggestion to extend their sphere of action". As illustrations of such tendency, Dr. Rowe cites the case of the clerk who becomes a 'crank on system' through the influence of an employer of systematic habits (243-250).

It is interesting to note that Dr. Rowe recognizes no greater practical utility of modern languages over ancient languages as far as the work in the High School is concerned. "Practically all High School work in foreign or ancient languages", says he, "has as its aim habits of automatic interpretation, appreciation, and expression". With this view generally accepted, the choice of Latin or French would not depend on the fancied greater availability of the latter in some remotely possible situation but on the superiority of the more highly inflected language as an instrument for the acquisition of habits of automatic interpretation, appreciation, and expression. With such an agreement as to the aim, the advocates of the Direct Method would need to convince us that the ability to express the thrilling tale of the adventures of Little Red Riding,

hood in Roman child prattle would be an exercise of greater educational value than a youngster's struggles with the assistance of a teacher to express in intelligible English ten lines of Caesar.

In conclusion, while in this article, which has already exceeded its contemplated limits, it has been possible to outline with brevity the position of but three writers as to formal discipline, a further study of the contributions in such current publications as the *Educational Review* and the *American Journal of Psychology* would serve but to confirm what we have already seen—that pedagogical thought of to-day is distinctly more conservative than it was some years ago¹. Accordingly we may conclude that we are not so desperately in need of dangerous remedies as the venders of such nostrums—or should we say *nostra*—would have us believe. In the meantime may we not justifiably urge upon the enthusiastic promoters of the Direct Method the propriety of more thoroughly testing the virtues of their magic radium in their own schools and classes before advising us to abandon methods which many of us feel have now been so improved as satisfactorily to meet the demands of modern pedagogy, as set forth in the works of the most advanced thinkers and writers of to-day? As laboratory material, the young of the genus *homo* are rather too precious to justify experimentation on a large scale.

BOYS' HIGH SCHOOL, BROOKLYN. WILLIAM A. JENNER.

REVIEW

The Message of Greek Art. By H. H. Powers. New York: The Macmillan Company (1913). Pp. 336; Figures 137. \$2.00.

This book is excellently adapted to a circle of general readers of culture. It should certainly appeal also to all students of art, not merely of Greek art, as well as to intelligent visitors to European museums. The book can be highly recommended also to teachers and students of Greek history, for Dr. Powers lays much emphasis on the historical background and never disassociates Greek sculpture from Greek civilization, as a list of the titles of the chapters shows:

I Introduction. Things Greek; II The Kingdom of Minos. The Aegean Civilization 3000 (?)–1000 (?) B.C.; III The Newcomers and their Art. The Invasion of the Northerners. 1500(?)–1000(?) B. C.; IV The Worshipper and his Wooden Image. Cult Statues. The Earliest Greek Sculpture; V Temple Builders and Painters. Why the Greeks painted the Parthenon; VI Art and Tyrants. Pisistratus and his New Program for Athens. 560–510 B. C.; VII Art and Democracy. The Democratic Reaction and Victory over Persia. 510–450 B. C.; VIII Athens becomes an Empire. The Delian League. Pericles and Phidias. 450–400 B. C.; IX Art and Empire. The Building of the Parthenon, the Propylaea and the Erechtheum; X New Ideals in Art. Phidias and the

Parthenon Sculptures; XI Art and the Scientists. Myron: Polyclitus and his Canon; XII Art and the Philosophers. Praxiteles and Scopas. 400–338 B. C.; XIII The Diffusion of Art. Greek Memorials to the Dead; XIV The Mutual Conquest. Greece and Alexander. 338–300 B. C.; XV Dispersion and Transfusion. Alexandria, Rhodes, and Pergamon. 300–146 B. C.

Throughout these chapters the laws and principles and tendencies of Greek sculpture are interpreted, and Greek art is made to tell its vital and significant message about the personality and life and ideals of the Greeks. Dr. Powers, who is President of the Bureau of University Travel, has carefully studied at first hand the great works of Greek sculpture, and has shown good taste in his selection of works to be discussed or used as examples. He writes with lucidity and originality. He is a connoisseur of good judgment, and his book will prove very stimulating, as did his *Mornings with Masters of Art*, to which this is a companion volume.

The remarks and methods of Dr. Powers are, however, not so new as he would have us believe, for not all archaeologists are such specialists as to have lost entirely their generalizing faculties: witness Gardner's *Principles of Greek Art*, Von Mach's *Greek Sculpture, Its Spirit and Principles*, and the works of Lange, Löwe, Robert, Lechat, Boutmy, Della Seta, and many others. Moreover, some of Dr. Powers's general statements do not tally with the facts, as when he asserts (101, 107) that the female nude was unknown until the fourth century, and that we owe our sensitiveness about the nude to the Greeks themselves. Even in Pre-Mycenean times there were countless primitive statuettes in marble or limestone, representing a naked female figure, standing erect and with arms crossed. There were certainly nude female statues in the fifth century, like the Niobid of the Banca Commerciale and the bronze original (470–460 B. C.) of which we have a copy in the nude female figure from the Esquiline (Sauerlandt, *Griechische Bildwerke, Jahreshfte* [1907], 141), and as early as the first half of the fifth century we also have a nude female on the Ludovisi Throne. From the sixth century on the nude female figure occurs rather often in Greek art, especially in the Peloponnesus (Müller, *Nacktheit und Entblössung*, 140 ff.; *Jahreshfte*, 1912, 219 ff.). On vases the nude female figure often occurs in the fifth century: compare Euphronius's *Hetairai* vase in St. Petersburg, and many others. The Greeks appreciated the charms of the nude female figure, which they often represented in painting (cf. Zeuxis's Helen) and on vases, if not in sculpture; and, if we are to draw the curtain (109) before the orgies of Roman nude art, we must do the same for many Greek works of art. Another false distinction which Dr. Powers makes between Greek and Roman art is that the Greeks painted their statues and the Romans did not (69). Traces of color have been found on many important Roman statues, such as the *Prima Porta Augustus*, the

¹Reference may be made here to the papers on Formal Discipline, by Professors Angell, Pillsbury, and Judd, in *Kelsey's Latin and Greek in American Education*, 344–396.

Augustus discovered in 1910 on the Via Labicana, the polychrome Venus-statuettes of Pompeii, and many other works. In the Pompeian wall-paintings there is no colorless picture of a statue, but many examples of colored statues. The Etruscans and the Romans painted much of their architecture and sculpture, as well as the Greeks, nor is it true that we owe our instinctive protest against color to the Greeks. Again (143), Dr. Powers makes a false distinction between the Greeks and the Romans in the matter of the subtleties and refinements of architecture. The Greeks, of course, were the masters in these things, but Roman and even later architecture is not ignorant of the curved line and other refinements, as the articles of Goodyear and others have shown (compare Professor Goodyear's recent book on Greek Refinements, published by the Yale University Press, in 1912). Even the interesting imitation of the Parthenon which one sees to-day in Nashville, Tennessee, has curves.

Chapters II and III, which contain much irrelevant matter, seem to me the weakest; they certainly do not give the message of the Minoan, or, as Dr. Powers calls it, the Aegean Civilization. Two large vases in Candia, Nestor's cup, a few of the gold discs from Mycenae, and the Vaphio cups surely are not enough illustrations to give the faintest conception of the wonderful art of the Minoans in paintings, in vases, and in metal and stone work; nor does the text betray any real acquaintance with the great works of Cretan art. On page 33, Corinth is said to have had a monopoly of vases for more than a century, but along with early Corinthian vases the so-called Rhodian, Melian, Naucratic, Vourva vases, and, with later Corinthian vases, Boeotian, Samian, Cyrenaic, or Laconian, Chalcidian vases and Caeretan hydrias were very numerous. Moreover, it is not accurate to give (34, Fig. 8) a small Proto-Corinthian *Lecythus* in Boston as an example of a Corinthian vase, and to compare real Corinthian vases with a type of ware which some scholars think was made at Argos or Sicyon or elsewhere. The red-figured style began long before the beginning of the fifth century (36), perhaps as early as 530 or 540. The statement (38) that the Greeks could not make works of art in bronze and gold and that the potter's art was the one art that the Greeks brought into the land which they appropriated is very surprising. In fact, Chapter III is very confused, and has little material bearing on its caption, The Invasion of the Northerners, 1500 (?)–1000(?) B.C. All the illustrations (a geometric vase, a Proto-Corinthian *lekythus*, an amphora by Amasis, and a red-figured *loutrophoros*) are of vases much later than 1000 B.C. Moreover, they do not give the wonderful message of Greek vases, an important department of Greek art with which Dr. Powers is evidently not very familiar.

Chapters IV–VIII are much superior, and trace in a very interesting way the development of the representation in sculpture of the female and male figures and of the pediment, with some guesses about the develop-

ment of the temple-plan. A few statements one is inclined to query. On page 52 we hear that the very rudest art in representing the human figure never forgets eyes and mouth. Why omit the nose? Primitive island statuettes often have faces with no feature except a long triangular nose; often on archaic vases the nose is as prominent a feature of the face as the mouth or the eye. According to many scholars, the group of two lions killing a bull (62) does not come from a pediment, and the three-bodied monster is probably not the Typhon. On page 78 the mistake is made of thinking that Athena is fighting with two giants on the pediment of Peisistratus's temple. There are in all three giants preserved, but Athena is fighting with only one. Other deities fought with the others, as Furtwängler's restoration shows, and his grouping of the giant away from Athena is much to be preferred to Powers's figure 22 (cf. *Sitzungsberichte der Bayerischen Akademie*, 1905). In speaking of the Aeginetan sculptures (117) Dr. Powers lays too much emphasis on the grin, which is not meant to be a grin. Moreover, the dying figure in the east pediment does not grin meaninglessly (if it is a grin). We are told (118–119) that the so-called Apollo on the Omphalos, which Svoronos now tells us is the Theseus mentioned by Pausanias, stands isolated as the high-water mark of art before the great days, and that Phidias gazed "long and earnestly upon such work as this, the last word in that long lesson which art had been learning in preparation for his supreme message". But this is only one of several Roman copies of a bronze original, which is probably of so late a date that Phidias did not see it. It is an exaggeration to say (128) that a stone's throw before the Nike Temple on the Acropolis is the Pnyx and it is a popular fancy with no scientific basis that "to the left is the Prison of Socrates before which grows the hemlock". From the sentence, "To the right is the place of the Stoa where Zeno taught his disciples", we should think we knew the situation of the stoa poeikile, which has not yet been discovered.

Chapter IX deals with the Parthenon, the Propylaea, and the Erechtheum, and gives some well known facts about these buildings, but takes no account of recent investigations. We read that "the crest of the hill lay not in the center but on the southern edge from which there was a gentle hollow slope to the northern edge" (133). The crest was not so very far south of the center, and sloped from there very sharply to the south, necessitating deep foundations for the Parthenon on the south side. Nor was the old Athena temple in the middle or in a hollow. Of the older Parthenon only the two lower drums of the columns ever were erected, so that we should hardly speak (134) of its still unfluted columns already in place. The new temple was probably begun before 447, and the western room is not a part of the cella. On page 147, it is said that the north-east and south-east wings of the Propylaea were about fifty by eighty feet with Ionic columns within. The rooms are about 76 by 42, and there is

no evidence of Ionic columns in them. It is unlikely that Pisistratus brought to the acropolis the unsightly wooden statue from the Brauronian promontory (148): Pausanias, in the second century A. D., definitely says that the ancient xoanon was still in Brauron. Pages 149-156, which deal with the Erechtheum, are unsatisfactory. Stevens's plan for the Erechtheum should now be adopted, and such an antiquated illustration of the Erechtheum as appears in Fig. 48 should disappear from all books on Athens or Greek art. Contrast with this the excellent illustration of the restored Erechtheum on page 318 of Weller's *Athens and its Monuments*. Dr. Powers does not know the real message of the Erechtheum, because he is unfamiliar with the problems and the recent researches about the building and the Caryatid Porch. We can hardly say (156) that the west wall of the Erechtheum may have been obviously temporary, a mere boarding up, as it were, until the time should come when the whole would be completed as planned, and that centuries later this temporary wall was replaced by a permanent one in Roman style, with windows and engaged pillars and other things not unbeautiful, but all un-Greek. This west wall is not un-Greek, because in the Greek building there were also half columns on the outside and pilasters on the inside, and the main difference was that in the Greek west wall the intercolumniations, except the one to the south, were closed by wooden grills instead of the marble screen (for an idea of the west wall, compare Hill, *American Journal of Archaeology*, 14 [1910], Fig. 3; and now Weller, *Athens*, 330). Moreover, windows are not un-Greek, since they exist in the Propylaea, and Stevens has shown, as Inwood and Bötticher surmised, that the east wall of the Erechtheum had windows (cf. A. J. A. 10 [1906], pl. 9; Weller, 321). Many would not agree that the Caryatid porch is bad in principle, and that the Greek did the wrong thing. Dr. Powers does not mention the omission of the frieze to make the weight on the heads of the maidens seem lighter, and if he knew the story of the Arrephori, he would not find so much difficulty (compare Elderkin, *Problems in Periclean Buildings*: see *THE CLASSICAL WEEKLY* 6.206-207). Why not a word about the North Porch with its beautiful doorway, which has sent its message to so many of our best modern door-ways?

Chapter X on New Ideals and Phidias and the Parthenon is the best in the book, and shows a fine appreciation of the Parthenon sculptures themselves, and of the development of pedimental sculptures, from the hydra pediment in poros and low relief to the east pediment of the Parthenon, "which must be accounted earth's greatest achievement in art". Such praise and enthusiasm make it hard to agree with Dr. Powers when he says repeatedly (130, 131, 160, etc.) that it is all but certain that not a particle of Phidias's handiwork remains, that not one of the Parthenon sculptures ever felt his chisel. The pediments seem in his opinion to have been executed after Phidias's death,

and in a style more modern than that which characterized his cult statues. According to him, the two groups of the several divinities on the frieze were done by two different artists (182). But there is not much more difference than between the Agias of Delphi and the Apoxyomenos, both of which Dr. Powers assigns to Lysippus—an opinion very interesting to archaeologists, who are in doubt how far the same sculptor can show differences of style. Pages 162 and 163 take no account of Furtwängler's remarkable restoration of the pediments of Aegina, nor of Mackenzie, *British School Annual* 15. 274 ff. We are told (174) that the theme of the Parthenon metopes is pretty uniformly the battle of the Lapiths and the Centaurs, whereas only a small proportion of the metopes had that subject. The illustrations from the frieze of the Parthenon (176, 177) are not very satisfactory, and are badly arranged. What could be more awkward than to divide the most important figure of Zeus, so that half appears in Fig. 66, and the other half in Fig. 67? Nor does Zeus sit on a stool as implied (181), but on a sort of throne with back and arms. Few scholars would date the Nike temple a generation after Phidias (186), or say that Phidias perhaps never worked in marble. If the marble head in Boston is mentioned (188) as a representation of Phidias's Zeus, surely the bronze head in Vienna should also be given (*Jahreshefte*, 1911, 35 ff.). On page 197 it is stated that "the Apollo of the Omphalos almost must have been a discus thrower". If he was an athlete, he was a pugilist, as the copy on the Vatican seems to show, or he may have been Theseus, as Svoronos believes. Moreover, this statue hardly represents the high-water mark of Pre-Phidian art, for Myron is essentially Pre-Phidian. It certainly seems strange to have Myron discussed along with Polyclitus in the chapter after that dealing with Phidias. The antiquated illustration of Myron's Satyr given on page 198 should disappear from books on Greek art. Now that copies of the Athena exist in Frankfurt, Paris, Rome, Madrid, Toulouse, etc., we should have the whole group illustrated as in Weller's *Athens*, 265. It is not true that, in the Sauroctonus, Apollo is transfixing the lizard (244). Von Mach and others believe that he had not even the thought of doing so. The illustration of the Cnidian Aphrodite with the tin drapery (255) gives a false idea of the statue. In the chapter (XIII) on Greek memorials to the dead, in which the illustrations are not good, there are several statements which could be challenged—as, for example, that the Alxenor stele represents a farmer, that the Greek artist never makes death his theme, that the relief of the Mourning Athena may be an early work of Phidias. But it would be unfair to point out all the other minor errors which occur in the book. Although it is to be regretted that Dr. Powers has practically limited his view to a single phase of Greek Art, since he so neglects vases, coins, gems, terra-cottas, bronzes, gold and silver work, that we have not the message of Greek art, but only

that of the important works of Greek sculpture, his message is valuable, and will prove very stimulating to all interested in Greek art. Such words as those with regard to the Demeter of Cnidus, which, however, may not be so Praxitelean, cannot fail to inspire the reader's mind with a love of a truly wonderful work of art (230):

But above them all, and ranking with the Hermes itself, is the wonderful Demeter of Cnidus, perhaps the noblest creation of fourth-century art (Fig. 91). Comment on such a face is futile. Nothing but long-continued contemplation, by varying light and in varying moods, can reveal its deeper meaning. Suppose that a Christian sculptor had wrought this figure and set the child upon her knee. Would not a devout Christendom have acclaimed this as the supreme revelation of divine tenderness and maternal love? But no Christian artist either wrought or conceived such a Madonna as this. Compare with such a vision as this the coldly mundane beauties of Titian, the emotionless placidity of Raphael, the joyless pathos of Michelangelo, even the spiritual beauty of Giorgione, and the hopeless inadequacy of the Christian artist in expressing his own ideal is at once apparent, while the purposeless subtleties of a Mona Lisa degenerate into irritating impertinence. Not fifteen centuries after Calvary, but four centuries before, the Christian ideal found its most perfect expression.

Such rhetoric is noble, but there is too much cheap and false tirade (208, 209, 326, etc.) against modern methods of teaching art and archaeology, which leaves the impression that the book is merely that of a connoisseur who cares little about the technical processes, the mastery of anatomy, and the composition of Greek art. Without the severe discipline of a thorough and scientific training in art and archaeology it is as difficult to interpret finally the spiritual content of Greek art, (which is after all, as Dr. Powers says, the important thing), as it is to understand all the niceties of the Greek language and literature without at least a little knowledge of syntax.

THE JOHNS HOPKINS UNIVERSITY. DAVID M. ROBINSON.

THE NEW YORK LATIN CLUB

The first luncheon of the New York Latin Club for the year 1914-1915 will be held on Saturday, November 7, at noon sharp, in Room 530 of The Washington Irving High School, Irving Place, between 16th and 17th Streets, New York City.

The address will be delivered by Mrs. Francis G. Allinson, well known as a contributor to contemporary magazines, and especially as author, with her husband, Professor Allinson of Brown University, of that delightful book, *Greek Lands and Letters* (see *THE CLASSICAL WEEKLY* 3.147-148). Mrs. Allinson's subject will be *Attic Memorabilia*.

The price of membership in the Club and of the three luncheons together is \$2.75. An additional \$1.50 makes one a member also of The Classical Association of the Atlantic States and so entitled to special rates on *The Classical Journal*, *Classical Philology*, and *Art and Archaeology*.

MEMORIAL TO ANDREW LANG

There has been placed in the Chapel of the United College, University of St. Andrews, Scotland, a Memorial Slab to the memory of Andrew Lang. It consists of a bronze casting in a frame of Greek Tinos marble.

The Inscription, in raised letters, is as follows:

· ANDREW · LANG ·

MDCCCXLIV · MDCCCXII

A · STUDENT · OF · THIS · COLLEGE

MDCCCLXI · MDCCCLXIII

ΧΑΙΡΕ ΣΤ ΠΟΛΛ ΑΓΙΟΤ ΕΔΟΣ ΑΝΔΡΕΙΟΤ
ΑΔΙΚΑΤΣΤΟΝ · ΕΝ ΒΙΟΤΩΙ ΕΡΑΤΟΝ ΚΑΙ
ΤΡΙΠΟΘΗΤΟΝ ΑΕΙ · ΝΤΝ Δ ΕΤΙ ΦΙΛΑΤΕΡΟΝ
ΕΖΣΙ ΠΟΛΙΧΝΙΟΝ ΟΤΤΙ ΚΑΜΟΝΤΙ · ΚΟΙ
ΤΟΝ ΕΜΟΙ ΠΑΡΕΧΕΙΣ ΕΚ ΠΟΝΟΤ ΑΙΔΙΟΝ

The Greek in the inscription is in letters of an archaic pattern, and may be thus translated—

A long farewell to thee, sea-washed seat of holy Andrew, pleasant to me in life and ever greatly longed for; and now art thou even dearer, little town, in that thou givest me, out-worn, eternal rest after toil.

The Greek lines are by Professor Alexander Shewan, one of Mr. Lang's friends in St. Andrews.

CORRESPONDENCE

I have had from a young woman teaching Latin in an Ohio High School a letter from which I wish to quote a few extracts:

In the last two or three years we have had quite an increase in the Latin registration. Out of a class of forty-six to graduate this year, fifteen will have completed the four years of Latin. Considering the fact that we have a widely elective course, including sewing, cooking, manual training and commercial subjects, and that by far the greater percent of our students expect to finish their school training with the High School, I think this a good showing for Latin. From a class of nearly one hundred and thirty entering the High School this year, ninety are starting in Latin. . . . I think that too many High School teachers of Latin are trying to crowd out all but College entrance students into the so-called practical studies. . . . My policy is to retain all whom I think to be profiting by the work. I find that it does not need much urging to get pupils to study Latin. Here it only needs the discontinuance of the former policy of discouragement. Of a total enrollment of three hundred and thirty, we have over one hundred and fifty in Latin classes.

This letter does not need much comment. With a liberal distribution of teachers such as this young woman, of sufficient force of character to counteract adverse influences from overhead, we should hear little talk of any tendency to serious decline in Latin study in the High Schools.

DENISON UNIVERSITY,
GRANVILLE, OHIO.

W. H. JOHNSON.